

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/030,992	01/16/2002	Mitsuru Uesugi	L9289.02101	9109	
24257	24257 7590 08/02/2006		EXAMINER		
STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP 1615 L STREET, NW			ROBERTS, BRIAN S		
SUITE 850	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2616		

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/030,992	UESUGI ET AL.
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/030,992	UESUGI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian Roberts	2616	

	Brian Roberts	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ado	ress			
HE REPLY FILED 14 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	26(a) and the engrapsis	ato aytansian fee			
xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS						
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ul>	onsideration and/or search (see NO	, will <u>not</u> be entered b TE below);	ecause			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	):	Caraba Maria a assessables				
S. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	byided below or appended.	ii be entered and an	ехріапацоп от			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>22</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>22</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-21 and 23-25</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidar	otice of Appeal Will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence	ot be entered is necessary and			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered b	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allows	ince becäuse:			
See Continuation Sheet.		M/	1			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(F10/30/00 01 F10-1449) Faper1	HASSAN KIZOU	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A			
	<b></b>	DOPY PATENT E	2600			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. The Examiner has reviewed the record and believes the rejection of claims 14-21 and 23-25 to be proper.

The applicant contends that McChesney does not disclose that a transmission side apparatus (1) dectects a capacity necessary for demodulation by a receiving side apparatus based on a reported reception quality and (2) determines a capacity for data retransmission based on the detected demodulation capacity and traffic conditions.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Figure 3, McChesney suggest a source radio (transmission side apparatus) that detects capacity necessary for demodulation by receiving from a destination radio (receiving side apparatus) a NACK packet (retransmission request signal) containing the channel quality measurement and the source radio utilizes the channel quality information (demodulation capacity and traffic conditions) to determine the power level and information rate (capacity for data retransmission) for the next transmission to the destination radio wherein the next transmission maybe a re-transmission of a previously transmitted packet (data) that previously resulted in a NACK (retransmission request sigal). (pg. 263, column 2, paragraph 3)